

Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: May 21-22, 2003

Reference No.: 2.8d
Action Item

From: ROBERT L. GARCIA
Chief Financial Officer

Prepared by: Terry Abbott
Division Chief
Local Assistance

Ref: **REQUEST TO EXTEND THE PERIOD OF PROJECT REIMBURSEMENT PER
RESOLUTION G-01-21, FOR LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS PROJECTS
WAIVER-03-09**

ISSUE:

The California Transportation Commission (Commission) allocated funds totaling \$4,289,000 in Fiscal Year 2000-2001 for the nine projects shown on the attached list. The implementing agencies have been unable to expend the funds and do not anticipate expending all the funds by the June 30, 2003 deadline. The attachment shows the details of each project and the delays that have resulted in the extension requests. The project sponsors request extensions, and the planning agencies concur.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department of Transportation's recommendations are shown on the attachment.

BACKGROUND:

Resolution G-01-21, STIP Guidelines, adopted by the Commission on July 12, 2001, stipulates that funds programmed for project development and right of way components of local grant projects are available for expenditure only until the end of the second fiscal year after allocation. The guidelines further stipulate that the Commission may approve waivers to the timely use of funds deadline one time only for up to 20 months in accordance with Section 14529.8 of the Government Code.

Attachment

Time Extension/Waiver – Reimbursement Deadline
Item 2.8d – Local Streets and Roads Projects
Program Year 2002/2003

Project #	Applicant	Extension Amount	Number of Months Requested
	County	By Component (\$ in thousands)	Extended Deadline
	PPNO	E&P	
	Project Description	PS&E	CT Recommendation
		R/W	
		CON	
		TOTAL	
Reason for Project Delay:			
1	Port of San Francisco	\$500	12 months
	San Francisco	\$0	
		\$0	06/30/2004
	PPNO: 2026	\$0	
	Construct Intermodal Bridge – Islais Creek	\$500	Support – meets STIP guidelines
<p>This project has been delayed due to community opposition, financial difficulties of the consultant preparing the concept plans, and approval of the concept plans from the servicing railroad. These delays in turn have resulted in delays in completing the NEPA document to obtain the permit from the U.S. Coast Guard by the originally scheduled deadline. This project was originally conceived as a lift-segment bridge, requiring an external mechanism (e.g., a crane) to open the span, with the bridge aligned in the center of the right-of-way. CEQA documentation analyzed the impacts of the bridge as originally conceived. The next step was to prepare the NEPA documentation. The community voiced strong opposition to the original design and alignment, and the design was modified to a mechanized span widened to allow bicyclists. Also, an alternative roadway/bridge alignment had to be evaluated. The consultant worked with the community to prepare concept plans, but had financial and staffing problems, leading to completion of the plans 4 months late. Also, elements of the work required Union Pacific Railroad approval. Their approval took longer than expected, 8 months after it was requested. Design changes required that environmental documents be re-evaluated. The Environmental Assessment is not expected to be complete and approved until at least December 2003.</p> <p>Due to these delays, the Port is requesting a 12-month extension of the reimbursement deadline. This includes approximately 3 months to allow adequate time for submittal of the final invoice and final report of expenditures to Caltrans.</p>			
2	City of Oakland	\$10	11 months
	Alameda	\$290	
		\$0	05/31/2004
	PPNO: 1016	\$0	
	ITS Deployment in the Oakland Airport-Coliseum Area	\$390	Support – meets STIP guidelines
<p>The City has been actively working to complete the project. However, the project was delayed by almost a year by the requirement (by Caltrans) to conduct a second consultant selection process to ensure full compliance with federal and state requirements. The PS&E phase is now expected to begin in June 2003. The City intends to expedite the environmental studies and design as much as possible, and plans to complete the PS&E by May 2004. Therefore, the City is requesting an 11-month extension of the E&P and PS&E reimbursement deadlines.</p>			
3	City of Oakland	\$0	18 months
	Alameda	\$1,000	
		\$0	12/31/2004
	PPNO: 1022	\$0	
	42 nd Ave and High Street Access Improvements to I-880	\$1,000	Support – meets STIP guidelines
<p>The City has been actively working to complete this project. However, the project has been delayed by almost two years due to a longer than expected environmental review process. The City had been working with Caltrans Design and Environmental to obtain approval of the environmental documents. Subsequently, Caltrans Local Assistance took over responsibility for approving the documents. The City submitted a revised Field Review Form on November 27, 2002. The City and Caltrans Local Assistance held a formal Field Review Meeting on January 7, 2003. At this meeting, it was determined that the City must submit additional technical studies, including a Parking Study, Socio-Economic Evaluation, and a Relocation Impacts Study to comply with NEPA requirements. The PS&E phase is now expected to begin in May 2003. The City intends to expedite the design process as much as possible, and plans to complete the PS&E by December 2004. Therefore, the City is requesting an 18-month extension of the PS&E reimbursement deadline.</p>			

Time Extension/Waiver – Reimbursement Deadline
Item 2.8d – Local Streets and Roads Projects
Program Year 2002/2003

Project #	Applicant County	Extension Amount By Component (\$ in thousands)	Number of Months Requested
	PPNO Project Description	E&P PS&E R/W CON TOTAL	Extended Deadline CT Recommendation
	Reason for Project Delay:		
4	Port of Oakland Alameda	\$1,142 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$1,142	20 months 02/28/2005 Support – meets STIP guidelines
	<p>This request for extension does not reflect a direct delay to the project, but rather a need to continue Port work funded by these monies throughout other phases/components of the project. The funds allocated in the environmental component are intended to cover Port costs incurred during multiple phases of the project. In this case, BART is proposing its own improvements that have an impact of the Port. The funds were programmed in the E&P phase because that was the first phase of the project during which the funds would be expended. In order to support BART in the delivery of their project, the Port is required to provide input and feedback on the BART proposed improvements. This puts the pace of the expenditures beyond the control of the Port. When the Port originally requested this allocation, it was unforeseen that the level of effort and expertise required to coordinate with BART would not be required until later stages of the project. This is largely due to BART's selected design-build procurement method. The Port wishes to continue coordination with BART to provide a high-quality, easy-to-use connection between BART's Coliseum Station and Oakland International Airport. An extension will allow this coordination and planning to continue through the start of construction. Therefore, the Port is requesting a 20-month extension of the reimbursement deadline.</p>		
5	County of Alameda Alameda	\$0 \$110 \$0 \$0 \$110	20 months 02/28/2005 Support – meets STIP guidelines
	PPNO: 2159 CMAQ Match – San Pablo Ave / I-80 SMART Corridor		
	<p>This request for extension does not reflect a project delay. The construction contract has been awarded and work is underway. In the case of the SMART Corridor project, the PS&E phase will continue throughout and beyond the construction phase. This is due to the extraordinary nature of the SMART Corridor project. It is a result of the SMART Corridor implementation plan, which requires the System Integrator/Manager (also the designer) to perform integration services during and after construction. Successful integration is required before the ACCMA will accept the project. The County intends to draw down the CMAQ Match funds in the PS&E component along with the CMAQ funds in the PE phase over the life of the contract with the System Integrator/Manager. Therefore, the City is requesting a 20-month extension of the reimbursement deadline.</p>		
6	County of Alameda Alameda	\$0 \$29 \$0 \$0 \$29	20 months 02/28/2005 Support – meets STIP guidelines
	PPNO: 2161 CMAQ Match – San Pablo Ave / I-80 SMART Corridor		
	<p>This request for extension does not reflect a project delay. The construction contract has been awarded and work is underway. In the case of the SMART Corridor project, the PS&E phase will continue throughout and beyond the construction phase. This is due to the extraordinary nature of the SMART Corridor project. It is a result of the SMART Corridor implementation plan, which requires the System Integrator/Manager (also the designer) to perform integration services during and after construction. Successful integration is required before the ACCMA will accept the project. The County intends to draw down the CMAQ Match funds in the PS&E component along with the CMAQ funds in the PE phase over the life of the contract with the System Integrator/Manager. Therefore, the City is requesting a 20-month extension of the reimbursement deadline.</p>		

Time Extension/Waiver – Reimbursement Deadline
Item 2.8d – Local Streets and Roads Projects
Program Year 2002/2003

Project #	Applicant County	Extension Amount By Component (\$ in thousands)	Number of Months Requested
	PPNO Project Description	E&P PS&E R/W CON TOTAL	Extended Deadline CT Recommendation
	Reason for Project Delay:		
7	County of Alameda Alameda PPNO: 2159 CMAQ Match – I-880 SMART Corridor in Oakland, San Leandro, Hayward & Alameda	\$0 \$143 \$0 \$0 \$143	20 months 02/28/2005 Support – meets STIP guidelines
	<p>This request for extension does not reflect a project delay. The construction contract has been awarded and work is underway. In the case of the SMART Corridor project, the PS&E phase will continue throughout, and beyond, the construction phase. This is due to the extraordinary nature of the SMART Corridor project. It is a result of the SMART Corridor implementation plan, which requires the System Integrator/Manager (also the designer) to perform integration services during and after construction. Successful integration is required before the ACCMA will accept the project. The County intends to draw down the CMAQ Match funds in the PS&E component along with the CMAQ funds in the PE phase over the life of the contract with the System Integrator/Manager. Therefore, the City is requesting a 20-month extension of the reimbursement deadline.</p>		
8	County of Alameda Alameda PPNO: 2183 Fruitvale Ave. Bridge Seismic Retrofit	\$0 \$475 \$0 \$0 \$475	11 months 05/31/2004 Support – meets STIP guidelines
	<p>The County has been coordinating with the City of Alameda throughout the entire process of this project. The County's Engineering Consultant submitted a Project Study Report (PSR) in May 2002 to the City for review and concurrence. It was expected to take one month, but was not actually completed until December 2002, six months longer than anticipated. Upon completion of the City's review, the County was apprised of the City's action to perform a feasibility study for construction of a new lifeline bridge at a different location than the Fruitvale Avenue Bridge. Given the significance of the potential of a new crossing on the strategy for retrofitting the Fruitvale Avenue Bridge, the County is adjusting the project schedule to coordinate with the City's study. The County anticipates completion of the study in 5 months.</p> <p>These delays have impacted the County's project. Therefore, the County is requesting an 11-month extension of the reimbursement deadline.</p>		
9	County of Butte Butte PPNO: 1L55 Skyway Widening	\$500 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$500	12 months 06/30/2004 Support – meets STIP guidelines
	<p>This project is to widen and realign an approximately 2.6 mile long segment of Skyway from two lanes to four lanes between Pentz Road and South Park Drive, across Magalia Dam. Magalia Dam is owned and operated by the Paradise Irrigation District (PID). One aspect of the project involves widening and possibly strengthening Magalia dam. A geotechnical analysis was prepared to assess the stability of the dam in the event of an earthquake. After the analysis was completed, the Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD) changed the status of the Magalia Fault from inactive to conditionally active. This fault is approximately 300 feet from the dam, and its reclassification invalidated the analysis. The County, PID and DSOD must now agree on how to approach the project under this new assumption. The impacts of a conditionally active fault must be addressed by either appropriate mitigation or additional geotechnical studies. Mutual agreement between the agencies is further hampered by unexpected cost increases related to analysis for the new assumption, changes in the PID Board, and high turnover in Butte County personnel.</p> <p>Due to these delays, the County is requesting a 12-month extension of the reimbursement deadline.</p>		